

Application No.: 10/593,822

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the January 25, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1-4 and added new claims 8-20 in order to further clarify the scope of the present invention. Claims 5-7 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Support for new claim 20 and the amendments to claims 1-4 may be found, for example, on page 5, lines 14-27 and Figs. 1 and 2 of the specification. Support for new claims 8-19 may be found in original claims 1-4. In addition, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to more clearly describe the invention. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Willis (USP No. 5,663,997). As claim 1 has been amended to be dependent upon new claim 20, Applicants will address the rejection of claim 1 with regard to claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that Willis fails to anticipate the pending claims for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the present invention, new claim 20 recites a glass recovery method for recycling glass of a display panel, comprising: separating the display panel into a front glass and a rear glass; analyzing a glass composition by using a first side that is included in the front glass or the rear glass and has not undergone a glass processing; removing a surface layer of a second side that is included in the front glass or the rear glass and has undergone the glass processing; and making the front glass or the rear glass into a cullet.

Application No.: 10/593,822

One feature of new claim 20 directed to a glass recovery method for recycling glass of display panel is the step of removing a surface layer of a second side that is included in a front glass or a rear glass before performing the step of making the front glass or the rear glass into cullet. As a result of this step, the homogeneity of the cullet may be improved thereby allowing for the recycling of the glass to a high-quality PDP glass substrate.

In contrast to the present invention, Willis does not disclose these steps. Willis is directed toward a method for determining the composition of glass and sorting the glass therefrom. However, Willis is silent with regard to a method of recovering glass involving the step of to separating the glass into front and rear glass. Moreover, Willis is also silent with respect to the steps of removing a surface layer of a second side that is included in the front glass or the rear glass and has undergone the glass processing; and making the front glass or the rear glass into a cullet. As such, Willis fails to anticipate each and every limitation of new claim 20.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently in a prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), and Willis does not disclose a glass recovery method for recycling glass of a display panel, comprising: separating the display panel into a front glass and a rear glass; analyzing a glass composition by using a first side that is included in the front glass or the rear glass and has not undergone a glass processing; removing a surface layer of a second side that is included in the front glass or the rear glass and has undergone the glass processing; and making the front glass or the rear glass into a cullet. Therefore, as it is apparent from the foregoing that Willis fails to anticipate new claim 20 or any dependent claims thereon, the Applicants respectfully request that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/593,822

**III. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The
Independent Claim From Which They Depend Is Allowable**

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as new claim 20 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Having responded to all open issues set forth in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

Kim Pollard
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION
Kim Pollard 4/25/08
SIGNATURE DATE

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty Reg. No. 53,508
for Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/NDM:kap
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: April 25, 2008

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.